



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,093	07/16/2003	Juergen Roeders	35802	9269

116 7590 09/07/2004  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP  
1801 EAST 9TH STREET  
SUITE 1200  
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108

EXAMINER

FOOTLAND, LENARD A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3682

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/621,093

Applicant(s)

ROEDERS, JUERGEN

Examiner

Lenard A. Footland

Art Unit

3682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 9-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8, 19-27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1-17-03, 2-5-04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 3682

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, as the claimed invention is not described in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the same, and/or for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

“Highly stiff” is indefinite.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim(s) 1, 3, 5, 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by British '818. The examiner finds all claimed subject matter to be present.

See p. 1, lines 15, 24.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the

Art Unit: 3682

subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 4, 9-11, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over British '818 in view of Ochai et al.

The examiner finds that except for those shown by Ochai et al., British '818 discloses all of the claimed elements and functions, including, for example, load response and constant clearance.

The examiner finds that the Ochai et al. reference expressly discloses what British '818 does not, the conventionality of monitoring pressure and responding via flow rate (col. 4, line 15-16, and abstract) to maintain constant gap. Applying the test for obviousness set forth in *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981), which is what the combined teaching of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art, the examiner finds that one having ordinary skill in the art would have found that providing the British '818 bearing with monitoring pressure and responding via flow rate taught by Ochai et al. would have been obvious in view of the teaching of Ochai et al. of doing so to maintain constant gap. Multiple and single controls of multiple pockets and variables is an obvious matter of official notice.

Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over British '818 in view of Lang et al.

Art Unit: 3682

The examiner finds that except for those shown by Ochai et al., British '818 discloses all of the claimed elements and functions, including, for example, load response and constant clearance.

The examiner finds that the Lang et al. reference expressly discloses what British '818 does not, the conventionality of monitoring gap and responding via piezoelectric/piston cylinder pocket volume (and abstract) to maintain constant gap. Applying the test for obviousness set forth in *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981), which is what the combined teaching of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art, the examiner finds that one having ordinary skill in the art would have found that providing the British '818 bearing with monitoring gap and responding via piezoelectric/piston cylinder pocket volume would have been obvious in view of the teaching of Lang et al. of doing so to maintain constant gap. Multiple and single controls of multiple pockets and variables is an obvious matter of official notice.

Claim(s) 6-8, 19-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lenard A. Footland, whose telephone number is (703) 308-2683.

**Fax: 703-872-9326**

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Lenard A. Footland". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Lenard" and last name "Footland" clearly legible.

**Lenard A. Footland**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Technology Center 3600**  
**Art Unit 3682**

laf  
September 2, 2004